

SL No. 168
1936.

B CLASS

File No. 507/36

P. W.

DEPARTMENT

A. BRANCH

Subject:— *Running Account Bills*
Orders regarding the
Preparation of.

V

B K 1936

File No. 507/36

Std. Sect. Slip 24 A

A.

DOCKET SHEET

File No.

507/36

P. W.

DEPT.



BRANCH.

References :—

Date.	To whom sent.	Notes and instructions.

Running account bills:
Orders in connection with the preparation of ---.

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY.
Public Works Department.
Resolution No. 507/36.

Bombay Castle, 10th September 1936.

Dl. Letter from the Executive Engineer, Ratnagiri Division, No.A. 1, dated the 13th March 1936, addressed to the Accountant General, Bombay, as under:-

"With regard to the above, I have the honour to solicit your approval to the following proposal which would reduce much redundant clerical work in the Sub-Divisions.

"2. The bills for each of the several Major Works in this Division are usually very large and the clerical work on account of preparing 3 manuscript copies of each bill, is enhanced to no small extent. Each major work is generally divided into several sub-estimates, e.g. the work of 'Constructing bridges and culverts over 5 big nallas in Section II of Hatkhamba-Peladpur Road' consists of 5 sub-estimates, one for each bridge or a culvert. This is again sub-divided into bridge proper, approach road, etc., and bills are prepared accordingly. One or more of such sub-estimates and sub-works happen to be completed long before the work is wholly completed and final bill made out. The procedure hitherto followed was to repeat all the items under each sub-estimate and sub-work, although no payment is to be made against a particular sub-estimate or sub-work in a running account bill.

"3. To make matters more clear, reference is invited to C.V. 83-H.O. for February 1936. It will be seen that no payment is due for the sub-work of 'Bridge in mile 57/4' and yet some 28 items have all been repeated. I am of opinion that no useful purpose is served by such a repetition.

"4. Under such circumstances, I think, it should suffice to give the total amount only of such a sub-estimate, in all succeeding intermediate bills, quoting reference to the original last bill, where the sub-work is paid. All the items should however be repeated in the final bill. This is analogous to the method of recording measurements of intermediate bills, in the case of which, items on which there is no fresh payment, are not necessarily repeated.

"5. This system seems to have been in vogue in the

past in this Division, as seen from C.V.5 for December 1932 and 17 for September 1932.

"6. Approval is solicited to the reintroduction of the same."

D2. Letter from the Accountant General, Bombay, No. F.W.I.Rat. 213, dated the 15th May 1936, addressed to the Executive Engineer, Ratnagiri Division, as under:—

"With reference to your letter No.A.1, dated 13th March 1936, on the subject noted above, I have the honour to state that under the rule in paragraph 556 (a) of the Bombay Public Works Department Manual both the 'quantities' and 'amounts' of each distinct item of work or supply should be shown separately in the bill except in the case of advance payments. The proposal made by you under which these details will not be shown in the intermediate bills in respect of completed sub-works, involves a relaxation of this rule which requires the special sanction of Government."

"I would therefore suggest that a reference may be made to Government through the Superintending Engineer, Southern Circle, and their orders obtained in the matter."

D3. Letter from the Executive Engineer, Ratnagiri Division, No.G.R.3, dated the 18th June 1936, addressed to the Superintending Engineer, Southern Circle as under:—

"I have the honour to state that I had made certain proposals to the Accountant General, Bombay, under my No.A.1, dated 13th March 1936, calculated to reduce some clerical work in the Sub-Divisions in connection with the above. That officer has however in his reply No.P.W.I.Rat. 213, dated 15th May 1936, suggested that orders of Government may be obtained in the matter."

"Copies of both the letters quoted above are enclosed, for favour of perusal."

"2. I am of opinion that rule 556 (a) of the Public Works Department Manual cited by the Accountant General, Bombay, has no direct bearing on the questions at issue, in that it applies to the work done each month for which the quantities and amounts have got to be specified in the monthly bill. It does not in the least lay down that completed or unoperated items for which there are no fresh quantities and hence no fresh payments to be made, should also be repeated in each bill. In fact, bills prepared in such an abstract form seem to have been accepted in audit in the year 1932 though the orders in support of the introduction or discontinuance of the system then in vogue are not forthcoming on the records of this office."

"3. I am inclined to believe that my notion of the rule is reasonable and calculated to reduce unnecessary clerical work without any chance of over-payment and if the same is acceptable to you, I request that the question involved may kindly be referred to Government for orders."

D4. Memorandum from the Superintending Engineer,
Southern Circle, No.G.R.3, dated the
3rd July 1936, as under:—

"Copy, with copies of the accompaniments, forwarded with compliments, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Bombay.

"2. Undersigned most strongly recommends that Government may kindly be moved to accord sanction to the change in the procedure suggested by the Executive Engineer in his letter No.A. 1, dated the 13th March 1936, in the case of running account bills so that the vast amount of clerical labour and waste of time now entailed can be saved."

Memorandum from the Accountant General, Bombay,
No.W.M. 104, dated the 11th August 1936, as under:—

"2. There is no audit objection to the proposed orders relaxing rule 556 (a) of the Bombay Public Works Department Manual being issued.

"3. It is further suggested that Government may also consider the desirability of extending this relaxation even to such of the incomplete items (except in cases where part rate has been allowed) or sub-works as remain unaffected since the previous running account bill, in which case it is enough if only the name of the items or sub-works and the amounts paid on earlier bills are shown in the succeeding intermediate bills. This may save further unnecessary clerical labour in the Divisional and Sub-Divisional Offices."

RESOLUTION.—Government are pleased to direct that, in the case of running account bills for a given work, all the entries pertaining to items of a sub-estimate or sub-work of that work which has been completed should not be repeated in the succeeding intermediate bills for the work. A reference to the last original bill relating to the payment made in respect of the sub-estimate or sub-work should, however, be made in the succeeding intermediate bills.

Government are also pleased to direct that, for any given work, in the case of incomplete items (except